

VOLUME 6.

NUMBER 3

PRICE 1/-

Christian Order

March 1965

Learning from the Communists

by

Douglas Hyde

Contents

Page

- 129 LIGHT FROM THE CONGO
The Editor
- 131 THE NEW LANDED GENTRY
D. F. Kenny
- 138 HANDFUL OF EARTH
E. L. Way
- 143 MONTHLY REPORT: FOLLY IN VIET
NAM
Daniel Lyons, S.J.
- 157 INDUSTRIAL ANGLE: WHY THE NEW
TAXES ?
J. M. Jackson
- 165 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, S.J.
- 171 LEARNING FROM THE COMMUNISTS
Douglas Hyde
- 189 BOOK REVIEW
Paul Crane, S.J.

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Brighton Terrace, Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who till now have bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that as from January the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 6.

MARCH, 1965

NUMBER 3

Light from the Congo

THE EDITOR

THE Congo tragedy has sickened us all with its senseless, brutal killings. More sickening still has been the hypocrisy which turned a massacre into the plaything of power politics, preventing a well-planned rescue operation from taking its full effect, thereby bringing the agony of torture and death in dreadful form to hundreds of innocent people, black and white alike, who might otherwise have been saved. In the end, it was the despised mercenaries who snatched many from the jaws of death, working round the clock to exhaustion point in order that innocent men and women might be spared the final horror of barbaric and bloody killing. Their major operation reached its height when the United Nations were busy passing a resolution, which included as one of its major propositions the rapid withdrawal from the Congo of Tshombe's mercenary force. This country voted for the resolution. Anxious to maintain face with its African sponsors, Britain, by implication, damned the mercenaries in public, whilst privately thanking God, no doubt, that they were in the Congo to carry through the rescue operation it felt unable to undertake without incurring African displeasure. One doubts whether hypocrisy could go further.

Yet, brightness has shone through the gloom of the Congo tragedy and the hypocrisy which surrounded it.

It cuts clean through the double-speak at UNO and the cant of liberal commentators so anxious to be with it that all capacity to face and speak the truth appears to have deserted them. The light comes shining from the missionary men and women of all denominations, innocent Christians concerned only with doing good, who were amongst the chief victims of the Congo massacres. Let us hope that their story will soon be told in full. Meanwhile, enough has come in to make one thank God that, in this barbaric and hypocritical age, there are still those whose love is given without stint to God's truth. At a time when all is questioned by the silly progressives who disfigure TV and foul so much of our press, making it their business to call in question and sneer at everything Christians have held dear; at such a time, it is good to be confronted with the quiet, enduring heroism of those who believe in God, whose lives have always been shaped by his values. I am thinking of the Lancashire schoolgirl of sixteen, come out to the Congo to spend Christmas with her missionary parents, who chose to share their death rather than live without them. I am thinking, too, of James Rodgers, a Scots missionary from Dundee, aged forty-five, who preferred to die barbarously at rebel hands with a young American colleague rather than desert him when his hour had come.

They say the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. Let us pray it will bring a renewal of Christianity not only to the Congo, but to this country of Great Britain. After all, what is there to choose between a Simba rebel in the Congo who gouges out his victims eyes, then slays him and a sexual fiend in this country who traps a young girl, ravishes her and does her in? The difference is one of degree rather than kind. Neither is sex the end of the story. This country is rotting. It will be rescued from its degradation neither by cant nor computers nor fatuous appeals to the Dunkirk spirit. If it is to have a future, this will come only through a renewal of belief in God. The missionaries in the Congo have shown us its meaning. Their death is our hope.

Big-business farming has turned many a rural area into a production unit where the clinical acres are devoid of hedges, trees and flowers. The new landed gentry have alienated the farm workers who can no longer look upon the regimented countryside as home.

The New Landed Gentry

D. F. KENNY

ANYONE who lives in an intensively farmed area of modern England will readily understand what I mean—unless he is a rich farmer—when I say that there is about such an area and about his own attitude to it, a peculiar barrenness. I mean simply this: that there is, between the ordinary countryman and the intensively farmed countryside no more feeling of kinship than there is between an ordinary man and an industrial site or a block of offices. Although he may recognise a utilitarian value in both the factory and the block of offices, he does not see either as somehow an extension of his more than utilitarian self.

There is about modern farming, about the kind of farmer it is producing and the effect it is having on the village community, that same peculiar inhumanity, that same emotional barrenness that we see symbolised in the factory and the large office block; but which we dissociate from a field or a hillside. The office block and the factory are, to use the modern jargon "functional": the other is, even to the least impressionable farm labourer, any of a hundred things that suggest peace and rest and security. The field is to him home, in a sense that is at once complicated and profoundly spiritual, and in a way that a street is not home to a town dweller.

Clinical acres

In my own countryside of East Nottinghamshire it is no longer possible for an ordinary man to identify himself

with the land because the modern big-business farming that now dominates this countryside has no meaning, no personality in which he can find a relationship and a feeling of satisfaction. He can look over these flat lands twenty miles west towards Nottingham, nine miles north to Newark-on-Trent and nine miles east to Grantham and see only a flat expanse of immaculate, clinically clean acres of wheat and barley, with only here and there the friendliness of a meadow or a small clump of trees with a chimney or a church tower rising out of them. Over the last four years he has seen mechanical diggers and bulldozers ripping up hedges and pulling down trees; and now he sees emerging a great expanse of prairie; as radiant in the sun at harvest time, as the sun itself. At the right time, here and there amidst this seemingly endless table of prosperity, he catches sight of a combine harvester, and tractors taking away trailers containing tons of grain. Over the whole expanse his eye will see perhaps only a dozen signs of habitation: the grouping of trees surrounding a hamlet or a large farm.

He will be struck by the thought, if he is perceptive, that these few signs of human life look insignificant; that by far the most important feature of the landscape is the wheat and the barley; and between the cottage homesteads and this great production unit there is no sympathy. The unit, if only because of its richness and its size, is more significant than the cottage: the tractor and the combine harvester are more important than the men who drive them.

A Production Unit

So now at last I am aware that my own countryside has become a production unit. The full significance of this was brought home to me the other day as I stood on a ridge of land to the south of my cottage and looked out along the line of pylons that stand like nude giants over the wheat and trail wires to Newark's power station smoking on the northern perimeter of this plain. The voice of my Socialist education told me that this was fine, that this great plain, from which trees and hedges, wild

flowers and weeds and all homely, wayward growth is being quickly eliminated, was an embryo of the planned Utopia. There in front of me were all the signs: the richness, the culture, the regimented orderliness. There was the apotheosis of mathematics: symmetry achieved by the elimination of all that is wayward, contrary, asymmetrical.

Must I confess that I was angry, that the growing sense of loneliness that I have felt in the midst of this regimented countryside contracted then into an oppression as I thought of the generations of ordinary, wayward, sinful men that have lived, farmed in a small way, loved, and reared children on this land, and for whom it has meant, in the profound, intimate sense that a wife, children, laughter and music round one's own hearth can mean, security and something of the eternal life.

"But", said the voice of my education, "this small, domestic farming would be quite contrary to the interests of the community in a modern market society."

I must confess how I detested that education for its lie; for every bit of its neat, constricting, uncomprehending mathematical mentality that recognises and accepts only what conforms to its own symmetry and rejects what is alien, misshapen, incalculable or otherwise unsuitable to its pattern for the future. If this countryside has any longer a presiding spirit it is no local genius: for the spirits of the woodlands and meadows have long since been driven away; and I felt much I suppose as the worker who gazes through the wire mesh fence at his factory site and feels no kinship; no upsurge of gratitude that this belongs to him and he belongs to it. It is a barren experience.

Big-Business Farming

The kind of spirual tyranny I have been describing is all the harder to bear because the executors of this policy of farming at local level—I have referred to them as the nouveau-riche landed gentry—hold their power by unjustifiable means, and make no return, no concession to the country community. The present policy of encouraging

big-business farming by direct government subsidy and protection is serving primarily to establish a new class of rich landed "gentry" whom I have previously described as philistine businessmen farmers, with none of the high cultural and moral values of the old gentry and no abiding interest in the countryside, or the community of the countryside, beyond what they can extract from it. If it could possibly be shown that such a class is a national need then it could follow perhaps, that the establishment and enrichment of such a class was justified by certain requirements. But there appears to be no economically important reason for the establishment of this new class and for the subsidising of farm production.

In my own small village, which is typical of this intensively farmed East Nottinghamshire, there are four farmers and they are rich men. Between them they own two thousand acres (worked by eight labourers, five of whom are over fifty), ten cars, eleven large tractors, three combine harvesters, apart from a long list of the usual farm implements and more unusual items such as mechanical shovels, hay and straw balers. Three of them have had electrical grain driers installed within the last six years. Extensive farm building operations are a common sight throughout this area, and three of the farmers in my village have had considerable building extensions done in the last three years. A significant feature of all this is the fact that only one of the farmers works regularly on his farm, and none of them organises, takes part in, or, to my knowledge, contributes in any direct way, apart from his farming, to community life.

Village life destroyed

The village has, therefore, become little more than a group of farmhouses and labourers' cottages. It is no longer a community because we know that in a new sense the land—the *raison d'être* of the village—is not for all. There is no common life because there is no common spiritual contentment. The farmers, protected by government subsidy from the hazards of the market, and subsidised in direct proportion to the amount of land producing and

the amount of crops produced, have become rich men. By denuding the countryside of hedges, trees and other growth, so that every available square foot may be put under wheat, barley or beet; by employing as few men as possible and by paying them a wage that is so low it does not allow a labourer even the incentive to save for a deposit on a smallholding they have "rationalised" their farming and added to their income. So it has turned out that the farmers are separated from the community by their wealth, their indifference, and by the ordinary man's resentment of their unfairly maintained position and his own alienation from what he rightly considers to be his home.

It seems to me that the spiritual tyranny I have been describing is obviously a duplication in a rural setting of the illness that has long existed in towns due to the mismanagement of industrial relations. I think, too, that it will arouse in the man of the countryside the same instinct to rebellion that has become an accepted feature of industrial relations. Yet the phrase, "same instinct," is, perhaps, not entirely accurate. It is worth considering that the instinct which would drive the countryside to rebellion is differently educated and, therefore, profoundly different from the instinct which is the governing mentality of the town. This is due to the fact, largely forgotten, that urban civilisation and the soul of the countryside are quite opposite to each other: not so much as two different ways of the same life as basically two different lives, in the sense that they are two distinct kinds of thought informed by two distinct kinds of metaphor.

Mechanistic mentality

I would describe the mentality of urban industrialism—which is the epitome of modern urban civilisation — as mechanistic; inspired by technology. While the mechanistic mentality both consciously and unconsciously burns with a desire for mathematical prediction and control in all spheres, the mind of the countryside is inspired by a more profound, elemental and infinitely more liberal metaphor. It embraces natural birth and growth in all its diversity,

proliferation and waywardness; it is inspired by the natural rhythms of landscape, weather and seasons rather than by the geometric symmetries of science and technology. I would suggest that apart from the illimitable inheritance of ancient wisdom in the Church, there is now more than enough secular knowledge about the nature of man to convince us which of these two mentalities should reign supreme in the heart of the social family. If the marriage that sustains the family is a marriage of true minds based on a recognition of each mind's sphere of influence and on their true, relative importance then there will be no impediments to happiness, and no hurt. But the tyranny of either one will mean the disintegration of the family.

It is clear that the present tyranny of the mechanistic mind in the sphere of the countryside is not only a danger to the countryside as such but is also a political danger. In attacking the spiritual nature of the countryside the present situation is likely to overcome what by its nature must always be the last stronghold of resistance to that ultimate evil of the mechanistic mind — atheistic Communism. The immediate pressing danger then, is in the hidden persuasion (described in democratic jargon as a "climate of opinion") that would make us believe that this regimented countryside is part of a design for the promised Utopia, and that the land is really ours. Hidden and persuasive it would almost convince us that all is for the best in the best of all possible welfare worlds, and that certainly the establishment of a country way of life, organised solely for the purposes of big business, by philistine intruders with the mentality of urban industrialism, is both a national necessity and a national pride, in which we can all play an important, nationalised part, prefaced, of course by obligation and duties.

Development Area

The first of these is an enigma wrapped in a Socialist paradox: we must all respect the mystique of big business, because it is all part of the planned economy in the promised land. We live on promises. Then we must come to regard the countryside as a place to be "developed".

It must be a matter of admiration that a farmer, by ripping up hedges and trees; by destroying all the nasty non-conformist growth of wild flower and bush; by spraying with dangerous insecticides and weed killers; by the massive use of artificial fertiliser; by the employment of Massey-Ferguson and Henry Ford, state controlled science and large government subsidy and government sanctioned privilege and preference, finally and triumphantly turns a home and a locality into an enterprise: over which tractors, and heavy lorries, come and go, and return with a brawling roar, that proclaims the new "co-existence" of the field and the lanes with the armoured divisions of industry.

A visitor to my part of the country need not be a sensitive observer to feel the presence of that powerful mystique which is epitomised in the warning of our municipal parks: "Keep off the grass". We have only to think of the punctiliousness with which that warning is observed, to realise that there is a powerful persuasion behind it.

So what shall we in the countryside do? Shall we keep to the roads just as the people in the parks keep to the paths? Should we rejoice with Dan Archer and Grenville that the land is "ours"? Should we accept the priesthood of the National Union of Farmers? Do we admire the productivity per acre as, I suppose, good citizens in a planned economy should do; and do we feel a surge of fellowship with Dan Archer and Grenville and Uncle Tom Soames and all?

Perhaps it is more to the point to ask: do we feel guilty if this feeling of fellowship eludes us; if we cannot say "comrade" to any one of them? The "climate of opinion" would almost persuade us that we should.

However bad our crisis may be, financial stability should not be secured by leaving the old age pensioner to die in the cold. Pope John gave the lead to the Catholic world by the way in which he dealt with the Vatican staff.

Handful of Earth

E. L. WAY

SEEING the *Sunday Times* with the headline "The Secret of Pope John", my daughter asked me what was his secret. I answered that it was impossible to tell. The well springs of goodness and holiness were not really open to any man's inspection. It was one of the intriguing things about the secret of remarkable goodness that it remained a secret. She was plainly not satisfied with this answer. It was disappointing. At her age the word 'secret' has a fascination, a suggestion of the unknown, which a matter-of-fact and honestly truthful reply can scarcely cope with. So I tried again. While not knowing his secret, I said, there was one quality he possessed which might be part of his secret. He had the ability to put himself in other people's shoes; an imagination which pierced the surface of things. And if he then found that the shoes pinched, and he could do something about it, he immediately did so. This is why his response to experience often disconcerted those about him. They had not his imagination, they did not feel the pinch, and so were quite prepared to leave things as they were.

Great Illusion

And not only did he have this very unusual gift, he also possessed the intelligence to define it in a few simple straightforward words. Being a peasant's son he could call a spade a spade. And when he assumed the terrible responsibility and power of Peter the gift was not smothered under the trappings and splendour of the greatest office on earth. Judging things from the personal

standpoint he called the great illusion. And this is what most of us are doing most of the time. He put it this way: "We all like to judge events from the vantage-point of the handful of earth beneath our feet. This is a great illusion. We must take our view from the heights and courageously embrace the whole". And this he did constantly. Strolling through the Vatican gardens he surprised a gang of street cleaners. On seeing the pope approach they fled, and some tried to hide behind a wall and others behind bushes. He called to them: "Come out again, all of you. I won't do anything to you. I want to talk to you. Come. Hurry up, *avanti, venite!*" When they came along rather shyly and timidly, he first of all got them off their knees as soon as possible, and then asked them about themselves and their families, and how much they earned. When they told him that they earned about 11s. 4d. a day, he frowned and calculated how much that amounted to in a month. "No family", he said, "with lots of children can live on that. What has become of justice? Just wait, we'll change that". And he did. Starting from the *lowest* paid, whose wages were doubled, he altered all the wage and salary scales of the Vatican staff. And each child a man had was paid a family allowance. And we see to-day that the staff of the Vatican are paid more highly than those elsewhere in Italy. Pope John in summing up, showed once again that he did not suffer from the great illusion, for he said: "We cannot always require others to observe the Church's teaching on social justice if we do not apply it in our own domain. The Church must take the lead in social justice by its own good example".

Trunks Packed

When he lay dying (and we all remember vividly how his long drawn out agony affected the world), he did his best to cheer up those around him. He tried to smile. His words of consolation to those around him were repeated slowly. His once animated gestures were now only suggested. "Don't worry about me", he pleaded gently, "I am ready to take the great journey. My trunks are packed. I can go at any time . . ." Is it any wonder that this man

had such an impact on the world? And is there any doubt that if the Church was made up of men like him: employers, workers, clerics, the Church would also have a terrific impact on the world? Would we then discover that the Welfare State, the Affluent Society was suddenly bankrupt when it came to increasing old age pensions? Has no one wondered how strange and unbecoming it was that we as a nation should suddenly wake up one fine morning to find the kitty empty when it came to abolishing the ten-shilling pension of the widow?

The Other Fellow

Are we not once more judging "events from the vantage-point of the handful of earth beneath our feet"? We are not some of the old people who are at this moment dying through lack of fuel, and the right kind of food. From our handful of earth are we not presuming to advise the other fellow that he should work harder, go all out to increase his productivity, and not press for higher wages while we continue to enjoy our handsome income, or profits, foreign holidays, motor cars, fantastically expensive schooling for our children, and everything our incomes afford? Of course the other fellow is not an idiot. He is instantly aware of the double standard. He sees that it is he who has to make all the sacrifices. His widow who, if not now, in the very recent past, could not earn money without her pension being reduced while the widow with a comfortable annuity could draw hers without hindrance or fine. Does anyone really think that this sort of distinction unites the nation with a common purpose? No wonder the workers at the nearest building site are frequently absent, or have left in search of that extra sixpence an hour.

National Purpose

One of the most urgent needs of our time is a national sense of purpose. And I don't mean the sense of purpose that is created by Bingo. Now we shall never achieve this while on the one hand a class of people argues that to put up the income tax reduces initiative, generally paralyses

its will, and freezes up its spirit of enterprise, while, if at the same time, this class argues that there is another body of citizens who, for the sake of the nation, ought to live strictly within its means and practice wage austerity. There is here a great chasm which cannot be bridged. By all means, if necessary, let us change our ways of living. But the sacrifices cannot be expected from old age pensioners and others of their class only. If there is to be an age of austerity it must be an age of austerity for all. The political logic, economic thinking, call it what you will, of the past cuts no ice with masses of people to-day. They simply fail to see that going without a holiday year after year so that they can pay their children's school fees, while somebody else goes off for a second winter sports' holiday, is a fair or a sensible way for the nation to balance its budget.

The Pope's Response

Compare our behaviour in the face of financial crisis with the behaviour of Pope John confronted by street cleaners earning 11s. 4d. a day. He could have nodded his head wisely, used matches to explain the financial set-up of the Vatican, urged the need for austerity, and gone to his lunch peacefully. Instead he declared "What has become of justice? Just wait, we'll change that". And he did. No wonder the world and his wife was impressed. Here was a man who actually put himself in the place of a large family and said bluntly "No family . . . can live on that". And some of the Bishops at the Council recently echoed his sentiments. Our vows of poverty, they declared, would gladly be embraced by millions to whom it would mean wealth beyond the dreams of those sleeping in the gutters of Bombay and Calcutta. This is the voice that will finally drown the voice of Communism. The voice of the Christian in authority *everywhere* declaring that social injustice must perish from the face of the earth. That it should perish because in so much as we deny elementary justice to any man we deny it to Christ himself.

The Cost

Of course, it will cost a great deal. Everyone earning sufficient will pleasantly permit the government's income tax inspectors to put their hands in his pocket. He that has two coats will thus be enabled to give to him that has none. But if the cry is to go up from the owners of wealthy and powerful newspapers, from businessmen, and from the professional classes that all the joy has been taken out of their efforts, and that they are not going to put their backs into their jobs because there are no more financial rewards, we shall sink back into a state of apathetic indifference and ribald cynicism. Justice indeed costs a great deal. But what we ought to remember is that injustice costs a great deal more. Is this not the reason why communism has made the greatest appeal in the most backward countries?

Example

"The Church must take the lead in social justice by its own good example", said Pope John. And everyone of us Christians is called thereby to give good example. Is it not, in some countries, a well known scandal that Catholic employers pay miserable wages to their staffs? Let those deny it who can. After all we are supposed to be followers of a man who proclaimed that the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests but He had nowhere to lay his head. How then can we go out to fight the communists for men's souls if we are pulled up short by the continual bad example in our own ranks? We must cease judging "from the vantage-point of the handful of earth beneath our feet", and cease taking away the coat of the man who has only one suit while our own wardrobes are full.

MONTHLY REPORT

A few Buddhist suicides upset the Americans and caused them to send Cabot Lodge to Viet Nam. He overturned the Diem government which had given the nation stability for ten long years, and which was in the last stages of defeating the Reds. The news has been overwhelmingly depressing since.

Folly in Viet Nam

DANIEL LYONS, S.J.

"JUST look at this!" exclaimed President Kennedy to his visitor, as he looked at a picture of a Buddhist monk committing suicide in Viet Nam. "Where is it all going to end?" The visitor was an old friend from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge. The time: June, 1963.

The sensational accounts in the press of Buddhist suicides, and the Buddhist claims of religious persecution, had upset Kennedy immensely. Although the official reports from the U.S. embassy in Viet Nam, from America's Central Intelligence Agency, and from her military headquarters in Saigon did not agree with the reports in the press, the White House was deeply moved by them. Since the president of Viet Nam was a Catholic, the Buddhists' cry of religious persecution disturbed America's first Catholic president unduly.

The U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Mr. Averell Harriman, a man of great wealth and mediocre ability, had been urging the appointment of Henry Cabot Lodge as Vietnamese ambassador. Kennedy told Lodge that the people in Viet Nam were against President Diem and that America's policy there was liable to fail. He urged Lodge to go to Saigon and take over.

Battleground of the World

Viet Nam is the battleground of the world, and has

been for the last ten years. The centre of the struggle between east and west, it threatens to remain so. In order to understand the situation in Southeast Asia we should know something about its recent history. Events have been happening there so rapidly and so tumultuously that we get confused about what took place last week, last month, and last year.

We are all well aware that Viet Nam was formerly a part of Indo-China, and that it gained its independence from France in 1954. But how did it get involved with the Communists? And how has it kept them from taking over thus far? What has the Vietnamese government been like? Who was the late President Diem? What has been the role of the United States? Perhaps the first question of all should be: why is the U.S.A. there?

America's troops are in Viet Nam because America is deeply committed to hold South Viet Nam against the Chinese-backed Viet Cong. If Viet Nam succumbs to the Reds, Laos and Cambodia will be surrounded, Thailand will be outflanked, and the whole Malay peninsula, including Singapore, will probably be lost.

The Diem Family

How did the Diem family come into the picture? Its members were among the most capable and most influential persons in the country. They were imprisoned by the Reds when the latter overran North Viet Nam, in 1946. Diem's eldest brother and his little son were shot and killed by them. The family were known for being anti-Communist and anti-Colonial, desiring nothing more than independence for their country. Diem was in exile in the United States in the early 1950s. By 1954 the French had wearied of fighting the Communists in Viet Nam and decided to pull out. Wanting to see the country left as strong as possible against the Communists, they selected Diem to head the country. Diem was installed as Premier in Saigon, and two weeks later the French sliced Viet Nam in half at Geneva.

Diem inherited a state of confusion, chaos, and anarchy. How could anyone rally such a war-shattered people? How

could anybody hope to salvage anything from the Reds? There was not only no government organisation, there was no government. The economy was bankrupt, and the notorious Binh Xuyen river pirates had actually bought control of the only police and security forces in the country, for \$1 million.

The fact that Diem had been exiled by the French for several years made it doubly difficult for him to assume leadership now. He commanded no troops. In fact, the head of the army, General Nguyen Van Hinh, was constantly plotting against him. General Hinh threatened a *coup* almost daily. He added that he would exile Diem and his family, but would keep his sister-in-law, Mme Nhu, "as a concubine". One day she confronted the general at a cocktail party and told him plainly, so that all could hear: "You are never going to overthrow this government because you don't have the guts. And if you do overthrow it, you will never have me because I will claw your throat out first". No one had had the courage to challenge him before.

Madam Nhu

Saigon began to take notice of Mme Nhu. Despite superior odds, she was the first person and for a long time she was the only person to demand a showdown with the enemies of that poor little government. She told her own husband he was "cowardly" when he recommended a compromise with the Binh Xuyen gangsters. But her courage was contagious, and the Diem family rolled up their sleeves and went to work. By 1955, Diem was able to place the fate of the nation in the people's hands. They elected him President almost unanimously, by secret ballot. In 1956 Madame Nhu was elected to the National Assembly, and she proceeded to upgrade the status of women, who had no legal rights whatsoever. The Vietnamese woman, she pointed out, was "an eternal minor, an unpaid servant, a doll without a soul". She put through the Assembly a Family Bill, outlawing adultery, polygamy, concubinage, and divorce (except by presidential dispensation.) "I have chosen", she said, "to defend the legitimate family".

Diem was not a military hero, but he had to try to unite his country and at the same time wage external war against the Communists. What he did remains one of the amazing military and political facts of this century: he took command of the army and forced the disloyal head of it into exile, he wrested control of the police from the notorious river pirates, and he unified the countryside. Diem had faced a nation in embryo whose rural areas were totally controlled by two religious sects with well-armed private armies. The intrigue he faced from all of these factions, the conspiracies, the treachery, the treason, the fear of overthrow and of assassination, all defy description.

Diem's consolidation of power under such impossible circumstances should go down in the annals of history. He should be restored to his rightful place as the Founder and the Father of his country. Like President Kennedy, Diem was struck down by assassins' bullets. They were not the bullets of a demented mind, however; they were fired as a direct result of the U.S. government's encouragement. The tragic story is almost too sad to tell. Besides, we are getting ahead of ourselves.

The Strategic Hamlets

The Viet Cong use Mao Tse-tung's recipe for guerilla warfare: use the villages to surround the city. The Communist strategy is based on terrorism. The Reds dominate the countryside in Viet Nam, while the government controls the cities, mainly two in number: Saigon and Hue. Unfortunately it is mainly the Communists who have been on the offensive for the past twelve months. Charles Murphy, the Southeast Asia correspondent for *Fortune*, wrote last May:

"A year ago the situation was reversed. Then the government of the late Founder-President Ngo Dinh Diem was advancing into the countryside; it was the Communists who were fighting a bitter, losing, at times desperate, retreating action . . . Buttressing the military programmes were economic, social, and civic-action programmes aimed at improving the lot of the peasantry . . . programmes for introducing better strains of rice

and pigs, for digging wells, and providing schools and dispensaries in the villages ”.

The programme for wresting control of the villages and protecting them from the Reds was based on the strategic hamlet idea that Great Britain had used so successfully against the Reds in Malaya, and that had been used to win the guerilla war in the Philippines. The plan was sanctioned by Kennedy. It called for moving 12 million people into 12,000 hamlets to be built by the Vietnamese government. It was to keep the Communists out of the villages and to persuade the peasants that the Diem government stood for both freedom and a better life. Diem made this programme his primary weapon and put his brother, the late Ngo Dinh Nhu, in charge. His chief adviser was Mr. Robert Thompson, who had been in charge of the strategic hamlet operation in Malaya. Thompson had been loaned by Great Britain.

Nhu set as his goal the construction of 600 hamlets a month, with 300 families in each. Thompson told him he was expanding too fast, that the army could not keep up with him. But Nhu kept on, with amazing skill and energy. By spring of 1963, only one year after the start of the operation, Thompson notified the British government that, to his astonishment, the Diem government already seemed “to have turned the corner and was winning the country back from the Communists ”.

Diem's Scalp

America's eminent and experienced Ambassador, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., agreed with Thompson's report, and continued to back the Diem regime. It was then that Lodge walked into the White House, and the decision was made to send him to Saigon. In the words of Charles Murphy:

“At this most critical moment, when the balance of affairs on the plus side was so fragile, there occurred during the summer of 1963 a sequence of judgments—most of them rather emotional, some of them vindictive, all of them unfortunate — that stemmed in part from President Kennedy at the White House, in part from the

State Department and in part from the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. What had been a relatively minor crisis inside Viet Nam was transformed into a crisis of confidence between the U.S. and the Diem government, and what had looked to be a winning counter-offensive against the Viet Cong was turned into the near disaster that Secretary of Defence McNamara is presently trying to redeem".

On September 2nd, 1963, America's *National Observer* had commented:

"Diem's scalp apparently has become the objective of United States policy in South Vietnam . . . Diem has made the war against the Red Viet Cong the first order of business. While pressing the war against the Reds, he has dealt harshly with internal elements challenging his authority. A clash with Buddhist political demonstrators last May raised a storm that is still continuing. So, all the signs indicate, Washington wants him out of there.

Washington has to cling to this way of thinking or face the fact that perhaps there are Communists in Vietnam, besides those carrying guns . . . Washington would have to recognise the fact that many South Vietnam Buddhist monks attended a Communist congress in North Vietnam last year . . . Our officials might have to recall the unpleasant fact that the government of Thailand has found it necessary to lecture some 400 Buddhist abbots against Communist propaganda.

Although Diem falls far short of what most Americans might consider an ideal leader, he has waged a long, hard, effective fight against the Reds in his country. Before American officials go blundering around any further over there they might take a coldly realistic view of the situation from where Diem sits".

Other observers commented on how the U.S. government "vastly oversimplified" the problem of the Buddhists. Experts testified that by the end of June, 1963, "the strictly religious issues between the Diem government and the Buddhists were satisfactorily composed".

Lodge—the Bull in the China Shop

In re-reading *Time* for August 9, 1963, an issue devoted primarily to Viet Nam, one is struck with how accurate their observations were. They pointed out that, since 1954, Diem

“ . . . has gone to great lengths not to offend the Buddhist majority . . . The U.S. still doubts that any of the available alternatives to Diem would be a real improvement. American policymakers also suspect that a *coup* would only set off a chain reaction of other *coups*, leaving in the meantime a power vacuum in which only the Reds could operate.

Into all this the U.S. is sending Henry Cabot Lodge to replace Ambassador Nolting, who in 2½ years in Saigon has been totally committed to Diem. The U.S. is hopeful that Lodge can make Diem more receptive to U.S. advice ”.

It was Lodge who was unreceptive. Untrained, unskilled, blindly prejudiced against Diem, and never having been a diplomat to any country, Lodge went to Viet Nam like an undomesticated bull in a china shop. On arrival he ostentatiously presented himself to the leaders of the Buddhists, before calling on the President of the country. Of course he could not speak the native language; he could not even speak French, their international language. Lodge was there less than 24 hours when he wired back that the Diem government had to go. His third historic blunder, but by no means his last, was to grant asylum to a Buddhist monk named Tri Quang, a man who was not only pro-Red, but who had been trained by the Communists, and who had been giving the government a great deal of trouble. Although it was against all embassy regulations, Lodge gave him sanctuary in the U.S. embassy for nearly three months, until Diem was killed. This same Buddhist has been sabotaging the efforts of every government since then, including the American. Madam Nhu was not far wrong when she said that Americans tend to be “Ivanhoes—perpetually in love with the underdog, but confused about just who the underdog is ”.

Lodge failed completely to view the situation "from where Diem sits", and so did the White House and the U.S. State Department. In the words of a respected professor in Viet Nam:

"President Diem's greatest mistake during the spring and summer of 1963 was to listen to the Americans. Washington forced Diem to dig his own political grave when it urged him in the summer of 1963 to be "lenient" and allow that extremist wing of Buddhists and students to create turmoil in the streets, and so to parade their false charges to the gullible American press and T.V. that the whole world began to believe the accusations against him . . . Diem knew that Tri Quang, the Buddhist monk, had served with the Communists and that the tumult was serving them. He knew all about those horrible Buddhist suicide squads in which monks brainwashed likely recruits, furnished them with gasoline and anti-pain pills. (The UN report on Viet Nam, December, 1963, describes these suicide squads.) Diem had every sound reason to end the mobocracy, arrest its leaders and its suicide squads, and get on with the war. Instead, to please the Americans he allowed the turbulence to go on for three whole months and in the process permitted the Buddhists to poison world opinion to the extent that Washington decided to get rid of him. It was a perfect vicious circle . . ."

The Fatal Telegram

The Diem Government was doomed. President Diem and his brother, Nhu, were killed as a direct result of a wire sent by the U.S. State Department. The telegram was sent to the U.S. embassy in Saigon, stating that unless Diem gave in to American demands for "reform", the U.S. embassy should encourage native generals to overthrow him. These so-called reforms included exiling his brother, Nhu, and releasing the anti-Diem Buddhist and student agitators, an event that would have started the riots all over again. The telegram was sent one Saturday, early in the fall of 1963, when Kennedy was at Hyannisport, Rusk was at a ball game in New York, McNamara was on

vacation, and McCone was in Los Angeles. It was concocted by Hilsman and Harriman of the State Department. The Central Intelligence Agency Director, McCone, reflected later that these two had "pulled a fast one" on U.S. officials. Lodge had the Vietnamese generals polled to see if they were ready to lead a *coup*. None of them were. But as Marguerite Higgins reported: "Everyone in Vietnam knew that America had declared political war on Diem. Everybody knew about the telegram".

Diem Dies While Lodge Slept

The U.S. then cut off economic aid, including deliveries of the material that made it possible to pay the Army. The Vietnamese figured, as General Minh later stated, that this was a signal from the U.S. that Diem's head would have to be blown off in order to get more American military help. Meanwhile, the *Voice of America* kept attacking Diem. Soon even those most loyal to him deserted the cause, realising that the powerful U.S.A. would win out. Finally, when Diem's life was being threatened by the actual *coup* itself, he phoned Ambassador Lodge, asking what our government thought about the revolt. Lodge, who is famous for his dedication to siestas, replied in just six words: "It's 4 o'clock in the morning!" Lodge went back to sleep, but both Diem and Nhu were killed that morning. Their brother, Can, who had kept central Viet Nam from the Reds, and under whom the war there had been going far better than anywhere else, was captured and killed later, as were so many other officials, mainly because that is what the new government thought the U.S. wanted them to do.

Since then, in a complete about face, the American government has tolerated mass arrests, violence, torture, persecution of anti-Communists in general and Catholics in particular, without protest. While visiting Viet Nam in January of this year, 10 weeks after the overthrow of Diem, this writer was told by Jesuits there that the 12 generals who led the *coup* ten weeks earlier had not been out of the capital since, that instead of fighting the war they were busy playing politics. I spent two hours with

the head of the military Junta, General Van Minh. Two things impressed me about him: his mild manner and his lack of any background as a leader of a country. But Lodge was working on that, too. As the Viet Cong were making more and more inroads against the government, he wired the State Department that he was giving elocution lessons to the General! The Vietnamese, of course, heard about the wire, and became all the more convinced of the "arrogant superficiality" of his approach. It seems obvious enough now that Lodge did not resign last July to help Scranton run for President, he resigned because the damage he had done so much to bring about was beyond all hope of repair, and there was little more he could do—even in the way of damage.

Depressing News

In the past few months the news has been overwhelmingly depressing. Some of it was just facts that the former government had known all along, e.g., N.C.W.C. reported:

"Buddhist officials have admitted, for the first time, that the Communist Viet Cong have been operating under Buddhist colours". Father Patrick O'Connor has recently written: "Communist suspects have been freed after arrest because they claim to be persecuted Buddhists, and some local Buddhist association has championed them".

Journalist Ray Cromley writes, after an extended visit to Viet Nam: "There is a steadily growing conflict between Buddhists and Catholics. It appears to be a political confrontation, not a religious conflict . . . The Viet Cong have set out to infiltrate Buddhist groups. North Vietnamese documents disclose Red boss Ho Chi Minh has ordered this infiltration to be given top priority".

Press dispatches agree that the Buddhist monks seem "impossible to satisfy". They want "more and more concessions". Hardly is one demand met when "the Buddhist clergy whip out another". Saigon's head monk, Thich Tam Chau, threatened a general strike "unless all Buddhist grievances were resolved by October 27". What were the grievances? "Provocations and oppressions". Said another monk: "Not a single Buddhist is satisfied".

Meanwhile, the Viet Cong is taking full advantage of the chaos. Reported *Time* magazine: "South Viet Nam seems to be paralysed by its own endless disunity". Again it reported: "As its authority in the countryside slips inexorably away, the government of South Viet Nam is running in tighter and tighter circles."

End Mobocracy

Many have commented that no government can stay in power there unless it uses "dictatorial measures". Declared Marguerite Higgins: "It is utterly hypocritical for Washington to give lip service to the notion that Viet Nam's problems can be solved by more democracy or turning over to 'civilian rule', when everybody knows that the military are the only cohesive source of power left". What Viet Nam needs, she concludes, is "a strong man who will exercise more power . . . Mobocracy has got to go. They need a military dictator who will brook no opposition to what is necessary to win the war". America had turned against Diem for being intolerant of opposition. Yet Madame Nhu tried to explain: "We consider Communism opposition enough in wartime, but we will have open declared opposition as soon as peacetime allows".

The *National Observer* reported a few weeks ago: "Johnson Administration officials privately warn that a total collapse of the Saigon government and a Red take-over are possible within weeks". A special study by the Royal Institute for International Affairs, London, reported, on the other hand, that it may take "at least another ten years" to defeat the Communist guerillas in Viet Nam. It all depends on whether they win first. Stewart Alsop commented a few weeks ago:

"There is no real optimism left among men like Secretaries McNamara and Rusk and Ambassador Taylor. About a year ago, McNamara and Taylor jointly predicted that the Viet Cong would be brought under control and most of the Americans in Vietnam shipped back home, by the end of 1965. Such hopes are now absolutely dead. The middle-level experts seriously fear a sudden disinte-

gration in Saigon, with a pro-Communist 'neutralist' regime taking power".

Jungle Hammock Required

McNamara made his prediction about being able to bring home most of the American troops before America caused the Diem government to be overthrown. Referring to McNamara's statement one day last August, a U.S. official admitted: "We hope it's forgotten". If there is any doubt about how desperate the U.S. government has gotten in the past six months, one has only to realise that its Military Assistance Command has set up a "suggestion box" for ideas on how to win the war. The suggestions are to be sent to A.P.O. Box 143, San Francisco. More than 100 suggestions have been received in the last 90 days. One idea that has been accepted was for a more compact jungle hammock. Whether or not the suggestion for a better hammock came from Lodge, or whether one had been sent to Lodge, was not disclosed.

Six weeks ago the *National Observer* commented that instead of prosecuting the badly lagging war, General Khanh has to spend his time fighting total government collapse. As one American in Saigon observed, it seems as though every citizen in Viet Nam is working to destroy the country. A group of international experts on Southeast Asia commented last June that American prestige and influence in that part of the world "have never been lower".

Laos "Neutralised"

Until June, 1962, we used to hear a great deal about the defence of Laos. Then the country was "neutralised", and America had to withdraw. Khrushchev wrote to President Kennedy at the time: "Good news from Laos". Kennedy replied politely: "Very encouraging". But any encouragement of this kind is only temporary. The Communists soon gained control of Laos, and instead of reading about the defence of that little country we now see pictures in the press of the premier of Laos being met by Laotian students living in Moscow, when he flies there for meetings in the Kremlin. President Johnson last January mentioned

Laos as one of the places that is "no longer a problem" to America. It was an off-hand remark, and, like McNamara's, no doubt the Administration hopes that it has been forgotten. Neutralism means that the free world can no longer help a country defend itself. It is "good news" only to the insatiable Russian Bear. Neutralism, in effect, is an abandonment of the most effective instrument yet devised against Russia, the policy of containment.

America's Assistant Secretary of State of Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. William Bundy, recently declared: "We believe it essential to the interests of the Free World that South Vietnam should not be permitted to fall under Communist control. If it does, then the rest of Southeast Asia will be in grave danger". He went on to say that the present situation there is "very difficult. No new nation has ever had a harder task . . . We are determined to go on doing everything we usefully can to assist that government". This is only proper, after the like of Messrs. Hilsman, Harriman, and Lodge did so much to destroy the only real government that wartorn little nation ever had.

Tragic Folly

It is a tragic story; sad to read, and to relate. In America there is a suicide every 20 minutes: 27,000 a year. Yet America is not unduly alarmed by them. But two or three suicides in Viet Nam, largely Communist inspired, were played up in the press so sensationally that Americans lost their heads. America was the direct cause of the Diem government being overthrown, a government that had ruled its people responsibly and successfully for ten long years. It had given to that little nation of 13 million people its first unity, its first solidarity, and its only hope of survival against 600 million Chinese Reds. Granted that America has helped them in their struggle, granted that this help has been indispensable; we must also recognise that the Diem government was in the last stages of defeating the Reds, once and for all, when America overturned it. There have been five different governments in the twelve months intervening, each one weaker than the last.

While visiting the government headquarters in Saigon,

and standing just a few yards from where Diem and Nhu had been buried by one of my fellow Jesuits, I reflected that here lay the mortal remains of the two men who had done more for their country than any others had ever done. I reflected on all that America had done and was doing to help keep the Vietnamese free from Communist enslavement. In spite of America's folly in Viet Nam, despite her failure to appraise the Diem-Buddhist crisis correctly, I prayed that all of the good and noble efforts of America and the free world to keep the Vietnamese Communists in check would not have been in vain.

President Lyndon Johnson is a very experienced type of person who plays a waiting game very successfully. He does not rush headlong into doing what might bring about defeat. But he is the greatest in-fighter in American politics, and he is not at all slow to act when circumstances or a safe line of policy open up for him a path to victory. The situation seems to call for a Chestertonian comment, and perhaps G.K. would have said something like this: "America will win out in Viet Nam, if she does not lose out first".

It is difficult to manage other people's lives, and much more so the affairs of other nations. Still, the free world has a solemn obligation to help. But we must be willing to learn from our mistakes. Otherwise, in the Divine economy of things, we are not worthy to help at all.

A Great Moral Miracle

"What wonder, then, that those who find themselves the very subjects of such crushing necessities (unemployment) and of such immense excitements (national strikes) all well within the range of the senses and of the least-developed mentality—show little or no ethical or spiritual experience and requirement? We should be face to face with a great moral miracle, did the case stand otherwise". — Baron Friedrich von Hugel.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

With falling exports, and emphasis on Commonwealth trade rather than trade with Europe, a succession of inadequate measures was tried. The new taxes, devoid of precise detail, upset business confidence at home and shook the faith of those abroad in sterling. Dr. Jackson also discusses a capital gains tax and a corporation tax in this article.

Why The New Taxes?

J. M. JACKSON

IN about a month's time, Budget Day will be here again.

Unless there is some unforeseen development, Mr. Callaghan will be presenting to Parliament his first normal budget. It would be rash for anyone writing in December to try to speculate on the conditions that will prevail at that time, and upon the likely content of the budget. Will Mr. Wilson's first hundred days of dynamic action have begun to bear fruit, and, if so, what kind of fruit? A good many people felt that the government's actions were bearing fruit even before the end of fifty days—though a somewhat bitter fruit. It is true enough that the Labour government inherited a balance of payments problem of a considerable magnitude. The rate of increase in the value of our exports fell considerably in 1963/64 compared with 1962/63. It is interesting to note that it was exports to the Common Market that showed the slowest rate of increase. It would be quite wrong not to take notice of this.

Emphasis on Commonwealth Trade

It seems fairly certain that we are having difficulty in holding our own in this important export market because there is now growing tariff discrimination by member countries against non-members. These difficulties are, perhaps,

inevitable, and they make it all the more important that in other fields our export industries should display the maximum efficiency. Nevertheless, it displays the folly of the Labour Party's economic advisers who showed no awareness of this danger during the negotiations over our possible entry into the Common Market. Their emphasis on developing Commonwealth trade was based on emotion rather than economic common sense. The desire of all the Commonwealth countries is to develop their own industrial economies and therefore to limit imports from Britain, rather than offer Britain an expanding market. For a time, there will be scope for considerable trade with the more underdeveloped countries of the Commonwealth in Africa and Asia. It is the semi-developed countries like New Zealand, Australia and Canada that will be most reluctant to admit our imports. Once a country has reached a really high degree of industrialisation, it usually becomes much more willing to permit imports from other industrialised countries and to accept the benefits of a measure of international specialisation. Hence the stupidity of pretending that the Commonwealth could offer a real alternative to trade with Europe. And this is quite apart from the folly of failing to think in terms of geographical affinities. Inevitably Canada will look first to the United States for imports, and Australia and New Zealand will look to the growing industries of Japan—in so far as they do not develop their own.

Given this level of economic thinking, we can hardly be very hopeful for the future.

The early days of the government appeared to be one crisis after another. First the import surcharge, then the autumn budget and then the 7 per cent Bank Rate. Why the succession of measures rather than adequate measures at first? Was the deepening crisis entirely inherited from the previous government, or was it partly of Mr. Wilson's own making? It was, I think, quite obvious when the import surcharge was announced that a substantial increase in taxation would be required, at least when the measures began to prove effective. Nothing was said about this,

however, until the time came for the autumn budget. Meanwhile, the import surcharge had created considerable and justifiable resentment abroad. It was, after all, a flagrant contravention of our solemn treaty obligations. At the same time, it gave no indication of any attempt to deal with the fundamental problems of our economy, and therefore tended to undermine confidence abroad.

The Budget

The budget was no great help in this latter respect. There were substantial increases in taxation, though the most important of these were merely prior announcements of changes that were to take effect in April. To this extent, therefore, nothing concrete was achieved by this budget. The increase in pensions and other social security benefits was not well-received abroad. There is a case for increasing these benefits, and it is also perfectly true that what we do in this field is entirely our own concern. If we choose to increase these benefits, it will be our own working population that has to bear most of the extra burden. Perhaps the one unfortunate feature is that the employers' National Insurance contributions are increased, and must tend to add to costs. (In some cases, it may be *possible* that the increases *could* be met from profits, though this does not mean they *will*: in others, profits may already be at a minimum, and the increased costs must be passed on in higher prices.) The same is true of other measures the government has taken—the petrol tax, for example. The worst feature of the budget, however, was the uncertainty created by the advance announcement of a new corporation tax and capital gains tax to come into force after the April budget day. Taxes of this kind are not necessarily harmful, and they are not necessarily the outcome of the evil machinations of socialists who want to revolutionise the structure of British economic life. Both taxes are, in fact, well established in the United States, the home of capitalism *par excellence*. The trouble was the folly of the government and its advisers in failing to see that the announcement of such taxes without details of rates and methods of application was bound to create uncertainties

that would aggravate the economic crisis. In the face of action that was bound to upset business confidence in Britain (the government could hardly have done worse in this respect if it had tried to do so), one could hardly expect foreigners to have much confidence in sterling. To this extent, therefore, the run on sterling that followed the autumn budget was of the government's own making.

In view of the far-reaching repercussions of the announcement of these new taxes, it is worth looking a little more closely at them, to see what the justification is for them, and what their economic consequences are likely to be.

Capital gains tax

There is a great deal to be said in favour of a capital gains tax. It is clearly unfair that people who earn a wage or salary, or for that matter receive interest or dividends, should be heavily taxed while others who are able to sell capital assets at a profit are not taxed. At the same time, it must be said that many Labour Party spokesmen have greatly exaggerated the extent to which people are able to live off the proceeds of selling capital assets at a profit. In the first place, anybody who is regularly buying and selling a particular type of asset in the hope of making a profit on it *will* have to pay tax, for in such a case the capital gains are already treated as income. Secondly, many people hold capital assets that are appreciating in value, but this does not automatically enable them to enjoy a high standard of living. It is only when a capital gain is *realised* by selling the asset that the proceeds can be used to raise a person's standard of living. It is clearly impossible for *everybody* who holds ordinary shares which are increasing in value to sell them and realise a capital gain. If *everybody* tried to do this there would be no buyers and the share values would immediately drop.

It is extremely difficult to devise a capital gains tax that is really equitable. A person will very often be able to sell some asset (whether it is a house or shares) for more than he paid for it. It does not follow that he has made a capital gain in any real sense. Suppose, for example, he

buys a house for £2,000. Five years later, he sells it for £2,500 when he moves to another district to take up a new job. He appears to have made a capital gain of £500, but in fact he cannot spend this gain on his ordinary day to day consumption. He will need another house, and unless he happens to be going to an area where house prices are lower he will need the whole of the £2,500 for this purpose. The government has made it clear that it intends to exempt gains on owner-occupied houses from taxation (on a basis of one house per person). This is reasonable, but the exemption should be carried further. It should apply wherever an asset is sold and a similar asset purchased. Again, in equity, there is no case for taxing apparent gains which have their origin in the falling value of money.

Less incentive to invest

The failure to exempt gains on the sale of one asset when another similar asset is being purchased may have serious consequences for those who own Stock Exchange assets. At present, people are at liberty to switch their holdings of shares as they please. If they think the prospects of a particular company have become less bright, they can sell their shares and put their money into some other enterprise. Now, if they decide to sell out while the shares are still above the price they paid, they will be liable to capital gains tax, and the amount they can use to buy other shares is greatly reduced. They will have to choose which is the lesser evil: to hold on to shares they do not really want to keep or to sell and have to pay tax. The most serious danger is that this development will reduce the incentive to invest in new issues of shares, and reduce the supply of new capital to British industry.

It is now clear that the tax will be imposed upon the increase in the value of the asset between Budget Day, 1965, and the date of realisation, or upon the increase in value over the original cost of the asset, whichever is the smaller. At first, there appeared to be some doubt about the alternative basis of calculation. Certain government securities, in particular, have fallen very much in value since they were acquired during and just after the war,

and it would have been a flagrant injustice to have taxed a person on the increase in the value of the asset between Budget Day 1965 and the date of realisation *when the latter value might still have been below the original purchase price*. Nevertheless, that serious commentators should have foreseen a danger of the tax being applied in such a way is another example of the irresponsible and ham-fisted manner in which the present government has handled its announcements on economic policy.

Corporation tax

The proposed corporation tax raises considerable difficulties. To understand it, one must first understand the present system of company taxation. At the moment, there is a 15 per cent on the total profits of companies. In addition, the company pays income tax at the standard rate on all its profits. But—and this is the important point—the dividends paid to shareholders do not bear further tax. Thus a pound paid in dividends to a shareholder is the equivalent of roughly 34s. of income on which tax has to be paid at the standard rate. It now seems probable that the corporation tax is to be levied at the rate of 35 per cent on company profits, in place of the combined profits tax and income tax that is at present levied. Where the present rate of tax amounts to 56½ per cent, the new rate will be only 35 per cent. This may seem surprising, and, of course, it is an illusion. The big change that will be made is that with the introduction of the corporation tax, the dividends paid to shareholders will be subject to tax as personal income. Profits that are retained by the company will only pay the 35 per cent corporation tax.

The impact of the new tax on companies will therefore vary a great deal, depending upon the level of profits and the proportions distributed in dividends. Let us take the case of a company earning £1,000 in profits. Under the present set-up, the government will take £562 10s. in tax, and leave £437 10s. to the company to distribute or retain as it pleases. The level of tax will not be affected whether the company distributes all or none of the £437 10s. (This

needs a minor qualification. In so far as dividends are paid to taxpayers who do not pay at the standard rate, recipients are entitled to a rebate from the inland Revenue of the difference between the standard rate of 8s. 3d. and the highest rate they should be paying.)

Under the new tax arrangements, the company will fare relatively well if it distributes very little of its profits in dividends, and badly if it distributes a relatively large proportion. Suppose it chooses to pay dividends to shareholders amounting to £240. Income tax will be deducted amounting to £99, giving the shareholders £141 net. Thus the total payments of tax by the company and shareholders amounts to £99 plus the £350 corporation tax, a total of £449, instead of £562 10s. under the old system. If, on the other hand, it chose to distribute dividends amounting to £480 (again before income tax is charged), the income tax would amount to £198 and the total of income tax plus corporation tax would be £548, only a little less than under the old system. If, however, distributed profits amounted to £600 before tax, income tax would rise to £237 10s. and the total taxes to £587 10s. or £25 more than under the present system.

Reasonable profits

There is, therefore, a more favourable treatment of undistributed profits. It is part of the philosophy of those advocating the corporation tax that encouragement should be given to firms to retain profits in order to modernise British industry instead of distributing them to shareholders to squander on riotous living. This, no doubt, is socialist prejudice which fails to recognise the fact that shareholders perform a useful function and are entitled to a just reward. There may be a case for imposing some limit on both profits and on the level of dividends paid out of those profits, but not for penalising perfectly reasonable distributions of profits. If a company is only distributing a relatively modest dividend to shareholders, it should not be penalised by heavier rates of tax just because this dividend happens to represent a relatively large proportion of total profits. The case for encouraging

retention of profits is far from strong. The ideal would be to distribute *all* profits, and at the same time to ensure that these profits were not unreasonably large. Prices would have to come down, thus making our industries more competitive in export markets, and capital to finance modernisation and new enterprises would have to be raised on the open market instead. This would have the incidental advantage of making finance more generally available, instead of only to firms that happen to have earned unduly large profits; the use of retained profits does not ensure that money goes to firms able to make the best use of the available capital, and it also tends to strengthen monopoly position.

Undermining confidence

Uncertainties about the corporation tax also had a disastrous effect on business confidence. One problem immediately sprang to mind. Would investment and unit trusts have to pay corporation tax? Investment trusts are companies which are formed for the sole purpose of investing the money entrusted to them in active enterprises. Their real advantage is that they can spread their investments widely and thereby minimise the risks taken. If they have a sum of something like a quarter of a million or even several millions to invest, they can do this, whereas a man with £100 or so to invest could not. He can, however, achieve something of the same result by investing in an investment trust. The good investment trust will be a safer investment than any single active company. The unit trust does something of the same kind for the very small investor. The dividends paid to investment trusts by the operating companies in which they invest their funds have already been taxed. Under the present arrangements, the investment trust does not pay tax on its own profits (the dividends received less its own administrative and other costs), but it was not immediately clear that the same would be true of the new tax system. It would be manifestly unjust to tax the same profits twice, but until it was made clear that this would not be done, tremendous harm was done to business confidence.

Why is there so much social injustice in Spain? Would religion survive without propaganda? Is the Oecumenical movement intended to speed up conversions? And should school-children do housework?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Why is there so much social injustice in Spain?

SPAIN is backward, in many ways and for a variety of reasons. The civil war devastated large parts of the country: foreign loans were withheld on ideological grounds: the discovery of adequate substitutes for olive oil seriously cut down one of the chief exports: Spain's isolation deprived her of modernising influences in social life: and an authoritarian government is so afraid of the Left that it leans too much to the Right.

Since Spain was paid for allowing the Americans to have bases on her territory, and with the growth of the tourist industry and hard work all round, the country's economy has greatly improved: but there is still much social injustice. Basic rights such as a family wage and education are still not universally enjoyed: and there are shocking extremes of wealth and poverty. A medieval system of great estates cultivated by peasants without property is taken by the proprietors as the design of Providence, and they expect the peasants to be content, in the spirit of the prayer.

God bless the squire and his relations,
And keep us in our proper stations.

The government also is complacent. It is said that the authorities took the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* as commendation of the Spanish system: yet there are injustices that have been brought to official notice by the bishops and others—notably unjust wages, and a denial of elementary rights such as freedom of association. There are trade unions, and councils of labour and management: but the

officials are not freely elected but are appointed from above. There is a strong movement in the Church, of clergy and laity backed by the Pope, to secure social justice. It has come late in the day, when the non-practising rate amongst nominal Catholics is staggering: but the movement is serious and growing, and it may not be too late.

If there were no religious propaganda, would religion survive?

ACCORDING to the Bible, and Christian teaching generally, religion is written in the heart of man. He becomes aware of his dependence, and tries to find the Being from whom he depends. That being so, the search for God would be continually renewed even if all propaganda for religion by families and churches were to cease.

Taking the satisfaction man finds in religion as an indication for his need of it, one could say that if there were no religion man would be unsatisfied and would look for the reality that would meet his need.

I don't know if it is possible to argue from external facts. In Russia there has been a planned anti-religion campaign for decades: yet recently the Russians have been bewailing the failure of their propaganda for atheism. Christian, Moslem and Jewish communities still practise their religion. But that survival depends mostly on the continued teaching of religion. In some parts of Russia where no ministers of religion have been able to work for decades superstition has developed to the proportions of organised religion: but even there a family tradition was preserved. I doubt if a real historical situation could be found or created minus religious propaganda.

Could religion be extirpated by the teaching of the natural sciences? That is the new atheistic line in Russia, according to the report made in November, 1963, by Ilitchev, President of the Russian Committee on ideologies in the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Certainly study of the natural sciences seems in some to be inimical to religion: but many natural scientists are believers, all the stronger in religion for their studies. The fact is that so far is science from explaining everything that every

advance in science raises more questions than it answers and never diminishes but rather increases the need of God.

Is the Oecumenical movement intended to speed up conversions ?

CAN you imagine what the "separated brethren" would say, were they to be informed that oecumenism had the ulterior motive of getting them to change their religious allegiance ! That would be yet another obstacle to the success of the movement.

I think the spirit of oecumenism is charity and justice. It is right to give people credit for their goodness, for their love and service of God, for their Christian living, for staunchness in their faith. We should try to understand people, in their history, convictions and prejudices, and we should try to live in amity with them and give them a chance to understand us. Some kind of oecumenism is a Christian duty.

But should we not have a sincere and practical hope of the conversion to Catholicism of others in the movement ? What else can we do, when we believe that, though we have much to learn, we have the full Christian revelation, guaranteed in the constitution of the Church ?

Will oecumenism help towards conversion ? The other day I read of a Dutch non-Catholic who said: "In the oecumenical movement, you don't change camp". Somehow the formal recognition of the non-Catholic Christian churches gives them in our view, and perhaps in theirs, a firmer status, as though they were countries, long considered to be rebels or deserters, to whom the mother country now sends ambassadors. There is also the suggestion that we are all Christians together, and unity is to be achieved not by everybody coming into one camp but by an alliance of camps under a general staff.

Catholicism can't cease to be a religion of authority and not of private judgment. We can't water down the Church's teaching on faith and morals. In oecumenism we shall need many virtues—charity and justice, and also loyalty and patience.

Do you think school-children should be made to do housework ?

I DON'T like the sound of "made to do". By the time they go to school they should have been so brought up in their family that they have accepted a routine in which they give a hand when a hand is needed. They start by wanting to help, and to have a share in grown-up tasks: and though they get in the way, and are slow and more trouble than they are worth, their good will should be accepted and encouraged. It is important that they should get into the habit of seeing what needs to be done and doing it without waiting to be told, not only because household chores like bed-making, clearing tables and washing up are done more quickly, and their mother gets a bit of a rest, but also because it is bad upbringing for children to have everything done for them. They come to expect to be waited on, to leave the dirty work for others, to consider themselves first and all the time, and to sulk if a request (demand ?) of theirs has to be refused?

Some mothers just ask for trouble. You would think they were running not a home but a doll's house. The doll is settled in a chair, dressed in her finery, and mother turns the whole place out for the benefit of the doll. If they started early enough, and stuck to principle, mothers could have helpful and companionable daughters, instead of the lazy discontented madams they train.

Homework has to be done by children at school: but there is always time for minor household chores such as washing up. Ten minutes or quarter of an hour can easily be spared from studies and recreation: and that short time is enough to establish the principle of team-work and charity.

To weep during prayer is a sign of emotional instability.

Why don't we drop the phrase: "The gift of tears?"

OUR Lord wept twice, once over Jerusalem, and once when he raised Lazarus to life. On both occasions he was praying aloud.

Perhaps the questioner is of the opinion that tears should never be shed except when the emotions are not

engaged at all—as in a merely physical response to a biting wind. Or does he think that emotions in themselves are right only when they are stable—meaning static? But emotions which don't move are not emotions: and if they move only themselves and not the person they can't be geared into human life. .

The normal human being needs the faculties and functions which involve both body and soul. For full receptiveness and full communication we must have feelings. We cannot know people and love them with the intellect only. What we call "heart" is as important as mind for reaching people. The strong silent man with the stiff upper lip is either a defective human being or a man under strict control for a particular purpose—to spare others distress, or to keep up their spirits in catastrophe.

Response to communication with people involves at least the features, which express all kinds of feelings. With most ordinary human beings play of features in excitement, or grief, or joy could lead to weeping: and that manifestation need not be from excess of emotion or loss of control.

Love of God is often said to be difficult because it does not stir the emotions, and God has to be loved by the deliberate direction of life to him, and the carrying out of his will: but there is in it no feeling—of joy, sorrow, enthusiasm. If some in their prayers have the help of their emotions even to the extent of shedding tears the prayers could be that much more genuine, and the tears would be a gift.

For many centuries, the Jews have been blamed for the death of Christ, though only a few of them were directly concerned in it. Now they have been pardoned. We have carried the burden of Adam's sin, in which we were not directly concerned. Why should not we be pardoned?

THE cases are radically different. For ages the Jews have been thought by many Christians, and by the official Church, to have been guilty of the rejection of Christ. That judgment is fair when it is limited to the

Jews of our Lord's days: after his presence to them, only about a hundred accepted him. We may suppose that it was those Jews who were prayed for as "perfidious" in the old liturgy of Holy Week. Popular condemnation of all Jews, because of the solidarity of the race throughout history, has been sporadic, as during the crusades. Usually attacks on the Jews were only partly religious in motive. The present movement to exonerate the Jews is part of a general effort at inter-racial sympathy, and it is to be welcomed as a renunciation of even the suggestion of anti-semitism: but it cannot be described as "pardon". Pardon of an offence against God by the Jews belongs to God. They were, in fact, pardoned in the death and resurrection of Christ.

We are concerned, by the solidarity of the human race, in the sin of Adam. We lack supernatural life at birth because it is no longer, after original sin, part of our inheritance. But we have had our inheritance restored, and we receive sanctifying grace in baptism.

The sin of Adam necessarily affected the whole of the human race. The sin of the Jews gave a special direction to Jewish history: but it did not debar the race from supernatural life: in fact salvation is through the Jews, notably Our Lady and the Apostles. As a race the Jews do not need a particular pardon: they share in Christ's redemption as do all mankind, and are included, in some way, in God's salvific will. "God wills all men to be saved".

Their Only Monument

"... and the wind shall say: 'Here were decent godless people: Their only monument the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls'!"—T. S. Eliot.

Learning From The Communists *

1: NEED FOR DEDICATION

DOUGLAS HYDE

THERE are two points I would like to make about this Seminar, right at the start, so that we can have its aim and purpose clear in our minds, and no confusion about the matter. Although the kits which Father Meehan has been talking to you about deal with communism as such, the seminar does not. *The seminar is a seminar on Christian leadership*—not on communism.

I think this is important because we do not want to take up the time and discussion with questions and answers on communism as such. That is not the purpose of the seminar.

The second point is that I shall be examining those methods which communists use in the training of their leaders which are capable of imitation or adaptation by ourselves, or which may spark off, I hope, some useful and constructive thought on our part. I am using communist methods in this way—in order to examine our own methods and in order that we may in humility look at our opponents and ask ourselves what they have to teach us.

In other words, I am not discussing with you communist methods, good and bad. I am not giving you an overall or accurate picture of communist methods in their entirety. That would certainly defeat the purpose of the seminar. I would hate to think a lot of nuns were going to use com-

*This series of eight self-contained articles which we publish under the general title of *Learning from the Communists* reproduces, exactly as they were spoken, six conferences given by Douglas Hyde in the United States to a specially convened gathering of missionaries in September, 1962. They have recently been published, as they were spoken, by the Mission Secretariat in Washington D.C. I am extremely grateful to the Executive Secretary, Father Frederick A. McGuire, C.M. and to Douglas Hyde for their kind permission to reproduce in *CHRISTIAN ORDER*. It is hoped that a book based on these extremely important conferences will be published later on in Britain by Messrs. Sands.—Editor.

munist methods to-morrow, or *some* of the communist methods anyway.

We shall not be looking at those we cannot imitate; we shall not be looking at those which for moral or ethical reasons we abhor; we shall be looking at those methods which have something for us. We are going to be quite selective in this, and it is better to have no wrong ideas about it right at the start.

Turning Point

As some of you probably know by now, I was a communist for twenty years. I joined the Communist Party when I was seventeen years old in 1928, and I left it in 1948. I left it knowing that communism was evil. I had seen that in my own life—I had seen it in the lives of others. If you accept an evil creed, inevitably your actions become evil. But I also left the Communist Party believing that in fact the communists were right in some respects. I still believe that they are right when, for example, they say that there is a great battle going on all over the world, that in the final analysis, regardless of all appearances to the contrary, that battle is one for men's hearts and minds and souls. I believe that they are right when they say that that battle is being fought in every country of the world and, therefore, it involves the whole of mankind. I believe they are right, too, when they say that the outcome of that battle is almost certainly going to be decided in the lifetime of people who are living now. *This is a turning point in our history.*

There have before been moments in man's history when the pattern of life for generations ahead was decided by what certain people did at that moment. The world in those days was generally conceived to be the known world, which was really only a small part of the surface of the globe, and involved only a relatively small section of the human race. To-day as a result of improved methods of communication, ease of transport, etc., when we talk of the world, we mean *the world*—every country in it.

When the communists talk of building a communist world in this period in which we live, they *mean the whole of the*

world—not the whole of the world with the exception of the United States or the United Kingdom, or wherever *you* might happen to come from. I believe they are right in seeing the battle in these terms.

Their aim is a communist world—they have, in the past forty-five years or so, achieved one-third of that aim. Now I do not want to give you a distorted picture:—to turn it round the other way, there is still two-thirds which they have not achieved. We are still living in a non-communist world—twice as much of mankind—twice as much of the land surface as they have. In other words, I would not for one moment want to spread some sort of defeatist idea amongst you. They have one-third; we have two-thirds.

But it is true to say, nonetheless, that never in man's history has a small group of people set out to win a world and achieved more in less time. It is also true to say that they have certainly brought far more people under their sway by their methods—not all of which we may copy—than anyone else has done in that period.

They have always worked through a minority—whether it has been in those territories where they have already come to power or in those territories where they have still to come to power.

You in America, and we in Britain, and certainly you people in the missions have to work with minorities too. The communists have had the problem of having to spread their influence and make the maximum impact upon others through a minority and they have arrived at certain conclusions and evolved certain methods which I think it is useful for us to examine.

Communist Influence

At the moment the Communist Party throughout the world has 36,000,000 members. Quite consciously and deliberately they keep it small and keep it as an elite. Of those 36,000,000 members, much more than half are behind the Iron Curtain. Probably not more than 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 are in the free world. We have 400,000,000 and more Catholics—the majority of whom are in the free world, so we have immensely greater human resources at

our disposal than they have. If they are more successful than we are, then it is not because they have more people—they have less. They are a far smaller minority than we are over those large areas of the world which are still free for us to operate in. Nonetheless, this group of people has influenced public opinion profoundly throughout what we call the free world. It is almost impossible for you to pick up a newspaper or to switch on your radio or television to the news without hearing some reference to the communists. It is much less likely that you will hear a reference to Catholics. But the communists make us aware of their presence the whole of the time. They profoundly influence the thought of a whole generation; they never let us forget them. This isn't just an accident—there are reasons for it.

I do not believe that the strength of communism lies in the strength of its ideas. I am quite sure that you cannot either. We believe, and we must believe, that we have something infinitely better than what they have. We have something immensely better to sell, if you like to put it in that rather degraded terminology, than they have got. Yet they have been able to influence our generation much more profoundly than we have been able to do. The strength of communism, I repeat, does not lie in its teachings; it does not lie in its beliefs, important as those are to communism. Those are not what have attracted people to communism, as any of you who have studied communist textbooks will understand.

I don't know how many of you have, for example, tried to read *Das Kapital*. If you have, you will understand what I mean when I tell you that Karl Marx suffered from carbuncles and it is said in communist circles that you can tell just how bad the carbuncles were by how unreadable *Das Kapital* becomes. There is a good deal of internal evidence to suggest that he suffered from carbuncles non-stop. Reading Marx, reading Engels, reading Lenin and other Marxist writers is not easy. They do not have any natural appeal. The strength of communism lies in its people—the people who compose the communist movement

throughout the world and the way in which they are used—that I think is vital to any understanding of communism.

Continuous Contact

I am not theorising. I do not want to go into a lot of autobiographical detail but it is the fact that I did spend 20 years with the communists. By the time I left the Communist Party every friend I had in the world was a communist, which meant that I lost them all when I left the party. Since then I have succeeded in taking the hurdle which is usually a rather difficult one to take for the ex-communist. Normally he is cut off completely from communists, from the living communist movement. I have devised ways and means of taking that hurdle. My contact with the communists has been almost continuous. There has been a constant stream of communists in many parts of the world who got in touch with me. Why? In the first place, very much to my surprise, because they found that I was writing about communism fairly and without malice, writing about communists as though I loved them and not as though I hated them. So communists with difficulties and with doubts tended to get in touch with me and this has continued non-stop for the last fourteen years. It started as a trickle, it has become a stream. There is not a month—sometimes not a week that passes without some communist getting in touch with me somewhere wanting to discuss doubts, difficulties with me. Sometimes they write to say they want to discuss their doubts; sometimes they write to say that having read one of my books or attended a lecture they followed through and they want to tell me that they were received into the Catholic Church last night, or confirmed or started their instructions or something like that. They do not all travel the long, hard road from the Kremlin to the Vatican. I know how long and how hard that is and it would be quite wrong to suggest that they all come all the way.

Some of you may know that in recent years, I have spent some time as an ordinary political prisoner in Oriental and other prisons where there are communist leaders who have been captured leading rebellions and civil wars. So this

time is spent in the closest possible companionship with communist leaders, sharing a small prison cell with them. This has often been successful.

When I am talking to you about the communists as people, I am not, therefore, theorising. I am talking about people who were my good comrades.

I am not talking to you about communists in one part of the world—a Western type of communist or British type of communist or American type of communist—I am talking to you of communists as I found them in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as in the West. Over all, I would say that the strength of the communist party lies in the people it attracts to its cause, the means by which they are able to hold them to that cause, the training they give them, the use they make of them.

Hard core often lapsed Catholics

Again, let us get things brutally clear in our minds. The human material the communists are working with is not something different from the material you work with in your schools, your mission parishes or wherever your work takes you. It is identical, in the sense that they are the same sort of human beings. But much more than that, it is identical in the sense that a frighteningly high proportion of those who become the hard core of the communist party are baptised Catholics. This is an unpalatable fact but we might as well swallow it at the start—making it quite clear in our own minds that we are not dealing with different material. Very often the communists are training and using the material that you once had.

Again I am not theorising. About one-third of the communist leaders of Britain are, I estimate, lapsed, fallen-away Catholics. Probably twenty-five percent of the Party membership in Britain are lapsed Catholics too.

Go to Australia and you will find that, while Catholics make up twenty-five percent of the population, the lapsed Catholics in the Communist Party are, perhaps, as much as forty percent of the leadership itself.

Here in America, the last president of the Communist Party in the United States was a fallen-away Catholic. When

he died recently, the funeral oration was made from Lenin's tomb in the Red Square, Moscow, by another lapsed Catholic who has now become the president of the Communist Party of the United States.

It is just as typical in your Communist Party as any other. You find it in Canada; you find it in New Zealand. This is not just an Anglo-Saxon phenomenon, still less is it just an Irish plot. This happens everywhere.

You go to Kerala, in South India, which is the only State in the history of the world which voluntarily, freely elected a communist government, you will find a very high proportion of communist leaders there bear family names which are those of saints. These are the ones known as St. Thomas Christians whose ancestors were, according to tradition, converted by St. Thomas the Apostle. They have a longer tradition of Catholicism than we have. You will find the fallen-away Catholic Indians leading the Communist Party there, just as elsewhere.

The reason is that your fallen-away Catholic is, perhaps, the most spiritually hungry of all spiritually hungry people. He has a gap in his life which he is trying to fill and the Communist Party sets out to fill it and sometimes does seem to fill it for quite a long time.

I am making this point because I want you to understand we are not talking about some special human material. All too often we are talking about, if I may say so in all charity, *your failures*, not just some different brand of human being. I want us to look at these people, to see how the communists take them and use them and train them.

Communist Idealism

In discussing the question of Christian leadership in this way, it follows almost automatically I shall be dealing with the problem at the natural level. I think it is theologically sound to say that the supernatural is built on the natural anyway, so there is no reason why we should not consider it in this way. As we look at it, we shall try to see where their strength lies, not where their weakness lies. We are not discussing the weakness of communism—we are trying

to discover where its strength lies and see if we cannot avail ourselves of some of that strength as well.

I would say, beyond any shadow of doubt one of the things which Communist Party members have in common is their idealism—their willingness to sacrifice, their zeal, their dedication, their devotion to their cause.

This characterises the communist all over the free world and I could give you examples of this non-stop, that would take the whole time of this seminar, because I have met so many communists and so many would fit into this pattern.

This is not just an accident. Later on I will try to show you how it is that communists are able to evoke this enormous degree of dedication. The communists do succeed in using idealism enormously effectively.

The majority of those who join the Communist Party are young. The average joining age used to be between seventeen and twenty-five, varying from country to country. To-day—and it has been true for just the last few years—it is between fifteen and twenty-five. That is pretty young to go into politics but it is nonetheless the joining age in most of the world to-day.

I joined the Communist Party at the age of seventeen, in 1928—I was a sort of boy wonder. People did not join the Communist Party at that age at that time. To-day it is perfectly normal for people to join it at the age of fifteen and upwards.

For example, the British Communist Party had a recruiting campaign recently. It brought in several thousand new members and when the general secretary made his report to the executive committee a few weeks ago, he said that the majority of those who joined during the period of that campaign were between the ages of fifteen and nineteen. That is not in a country with a different culture. It is in Britain.

If you go to Singapore, or if you go to Caracas, Venezuela, you will find the same in both cities. The party is recruiting more people between the ages of fifteen and nineteen than in any other age group.

I make this point because youth is a period of idealism.

The communists attract them by appealing to that idealism and they have been very successful in this. Too often, I believe, we have failed to appeal to the idealism of youth and we have failed to use it. And we are the losers.

Cynical neglect of youth

I will be quite honest with you. I would say that I have met more cynicism in Catholic circles about the idealism of youth than anywhere else. I have spent more of my time in non-Catholic circles than in Catholic circles. In fact, that is the way life takes me, but I do not think that you will find anywhere more than in Catholic circles such a cynical approach to the so-called starry idealism of youth.

I have travelled in nearly every country of the world and everywhere I have gone, I have found that young people are idealistic. I can only conclude that that is the way God wants them and I do not believe that it is good sense, quite apart from charity or justice, to sneer at the idealism of youth. Young people will have their dreams; they will dream of a better world; they will want to change the world and if we have no patience with them or make them feel that this is some kind of infantile disease, they will still pursue their idealistic courses; they will do it outside the family instead of within it. This is one reason why you find so many lapsed Catholics in the Communist Party and similar movements. We fail to use this idealism of youth at our peril. We do not simply lose these people; a portion of them go right over to the opposite camp, become part of the most formidable opponent the Church has ever had to face.

Certainly the communists have demonstrated that the idealism of youth is something which you can harness and use to tremendous effect. It is a dynamic thing. They use it dynamically while we too often fail to do so. We know all about fallen man and all that sort of thing. We know we are never going to have a perfect world, so we take at the best a rather superciliously tolerant approach to the idealism of youth, if we do not ignore it altogether.

The communists use that idealism, and communism becomes the dominant thing in the life of the communist.

Just that. I do not know if you can say that of our Christians. I can say it of the communists I have known all over the world, beyond any shadow of doubt at all.

Communism was my Life

I will start with myself. Communism was my life; it meant everything to me. I lived for it from morning to night for twenty years. It was my wife's life. She joined the Communist Party during the Spanish civil war and was drawn into its activities.

The communists say if you make mean little demands on people, you will get a mean little response which is all you deserve. They say if you make big demands on them, you will get a heroic response. They prove it over and over again. Call for a big initial sacrifice and the relatively smaller ones will follow naturally. At any rate, that is the communist technique and the communists make it work.

I am a non-smoker to-day. I used to smoke forty cigarettes a day and a pipe at night. I am a writer and I live on my nerves. Then on Christmas Eve, 1939, a member of the political bureau of the Communist Party asked me if I would join the staff of the *Daily Worker*, the Party's daily paper and become its news editor. They asked me if I would join and start work on January 1, 1940, eight days later.

I was proud to take on that work. I did not hesitate and felt it was the greatest honour the Party could pay me as a communist writer. But in taking on that work I accepted a two-thirds cut in my salary. The salary the Communist Party offered me was just one-third of what I had been earning for years and was, in fact, smaller than my expense account had been for years as well. Which meant that I had to take more than a two-thirds drop in my standard of life. It goes without saying that I was not smoking two-thirds of my income, so I had to give up smoking and a good deal more besides. Later on, when I was converted to something better than communism, I saw no reason why I should be re-converted to lung cancer, so I continued as a non-smoker. That sort of sacrifice which the Party

demanded of me was perfectly normal and it seemed perfectly normal of me to accept it.

Ready for Sacrifice

I will admit that when I went to the *Daily Worker* office on January 1, 1940, I felt a little bit virtuous at the size of the sacrifice I had made until I met my staff. Then I found that most of them were older men than I was at that time; they had gone further in their careers. They had been earning more; they had made bigger sacrifices in order to work there. Literally, we did not know at that time whether we would get our small salaries at the end of the week. We used to read all the nonsense about Moscow gold. We read it rather wistfully, wishing some of it would come our way. There were plenty of occasions when I sent the office boy around the office, from room to room taking paper clips off letters which had been thrown away because we could not afford to buy more. It was much more significant that we were keeping our organisation going on the basis of our sacrifices, than that we were having life blood pumped into our movement by some foreign power. Oh yes, the communists do subsidise communist movements, where they think that will serve the communist cause but they prefer that the movement should be based on sacrifice, and that is psychologically sound. We asked our staff members to make these sacrifices when they came to the paper and the sacrifices did not end there. We continued to make the same demands upon them as the Party makes upon all of its members.

There was a point at which the *Daily Worker* was banned early in the war by the British government because it was opposing the war effort. Our offices were raided. Our machines were sealed by police and I was told that if I produced another copy of the paper, I would be sent to jail for seven years. Of course, the Party told me I must have a copy of the paper on sale on the streets of London the next morning, which I did, as an act of defiance and as a gesture.

Banned and Bombed

Shortly afterwards, the plant which we had was bombed so we did not have much left of the *Daily Worker* by that time. We were banned and bombed. Then twenty months later the ban was raised. We were given a matter of ten days by the Party to put the paper into production again, find a new plant, a new staff, train the staff as quickly as we could. As soon as the paper got going and we got some sort of rhythm, into our organisation, as it were, the members of the staff began to wonder if they could do something more for communism than just produce its daily paper, although that seemed a vital job in itself. They wanted to be able to work in the area in which our factory was situated, making communists and spreading communism. So they checked on all the factories in the area and they found that there was a communist group already established in each one of them. They felt rather frustrated. They wanted to spread their communism. They wanted to build communist organisations but the communists were already established in the factories all around. So as leader of the Communist Party inside the *Daily Worker* building, I called a meeting of members to discuss this problem. Someone said "well, you know, there is a big hospital just around the corner and there are no communists there, we have already checked. We have no contacts with anyone inside. Here is a job for us to do." So the question was how could we start working inside the large hospital where we had no contact of any sort. I called for suggestions and at our next meeting someone came up with a good one.

200 Blood donors

He said, "London is being bombed every day; thousands of people are being injured, every hospital is crying out for blood, no one checks very carefully to see how often people give their blood because the demand is so great. Why shouldn't we volunteer to give our blood? This would give us an excuse to go back to the hospital time after time. We could get to know the domestic, nursing and medical staff. We could discover where they eat, where

they play tennis or where they spend their spare time and we could in due course, make friendships and out of the friendships make communists."

I called for volunteers, communists who would give their blood, for the cause of communism.

There were 200 members of our staff and I got 200 volunteers. They used to line up outside the hospital day after day to give their blood. It reached rather absurd proportions because there were times when I urgently needed a reporter to go out on an assignment and I would have to send the messenger to bring one back from the blood line. I stopped the operation in the end because the production of the paper was threatened when on one occasion the chief sub-editor, just as the paper was going to press, collapsed on the job. I got the staff doctor to check him over and he said: "This man has been so anxious to give his blood for communism, he has nearly drained himself white." That was the response of my staff to that situation.

Perhaps I should add that, as a result of that operation, we did make our first contacts with the staff, we made our first converts and twenty-two years later there is still a communist group functioning inside that hospital. That paid off very well indeed. Here you see the sort of sacrifices the communist workers are prepared to make.

Life had meaning in the Party

I mentioned to you communists who have gotten in touch with me and whom I have been able to help out of the communist party. I told you I have been able to assist some along the road to the Church. There have been many who have not come all that way. Of course, when people who have such a burning faith in communism, whose whole life has been given to communism, lose their communism they have nothing else. They are often rather pathetic figures. They remind me of a squeezed out lemon. Just everything has been squeezed out of them, I was talking to one such man on one occasion. I shall always remember the conversation. He had left the Party and he had

only his disillusionment, his cynicism left. We were talking together in my home.

He said: "Do you remember what it was like when we were together in the Party?" I should add that he is a man with a background of considerable education and from a very well-known family. He said: "Do you remember what life was like in the Communist Party?" He said: "You got up in the morning and, as you shaved, you were thinking of the jobs you would do for communism; you went down to breakfast, you read the *Daily Worker*, to see what the Party line was, to get the shot and shell for a fight in which you were already involved. You read every item in the paper wondering how you might be able to use it."

"Then you read the *Times* to see what the enemy was doing and you set off to work. On the bus or train you read the *Daily Worker* as ostentatiously as you could, holding it up so that others might read the headlines and, perhaps, be influenced by them. You took two copies of the paper with you, the second one you left on the seat in the hope that someone would sit on it, read it and be influenced by it."

He went on: "When you got to work, you kept the *Daily Worker* circulating, you would give it to a worker who would take it outside, read it for a few minutes and bring it in again. At lunch time, in the canteen or the restaurant, where you took your meal, you would try to start conversations, sitting with different people on different days, not thrusting communism down their throats but using conversations which would be brought round to policies in campaigns in which the Party was interested. Before you left your place of work at night, there was a quick meeting of the factory group or cell. There you discussed in a few minutes the successes and failures of the day; you discussed what you hoped to do the next day. You dashed home and had a quick meal and then you went out, maybe to attend classes, maybe to be a tutor, maybe to join in some communist campaign, going from door to door, standing at the side of the road selling the communist paper, doing

something for communism. You went home at night and you dreamed of the jobs you were going to do for communism the next day."

He said very wistfully, very sadly: "You know life had some meaning and some purpose, life was good in the Communist Party."

He was right. Of course, it was. It is quite wrong to suppose that it is only the saints who are not sad—sinners can get quite a lot of fun out of life too. This is a day in the life of a dedicated man. This is a normal day in the life of an ordinary, hard core Communist Party member.

Well, if you think of Communist Party members in those terms, then if you know they have 36,000,000 of these dedicated people you begin to understand how it is possible for them to make the sort of impact they do.

Dedicated Leaders for a Cause

Any communist leader running a leadership course of the sort that I am running here would insist right at the start that the beginning of leadership is dedication. You are not going to get the sort of leaders you want if they are not dedicated. You may turn out some sort of leaders but not the sort you want—not leaders for a cause. They may be leaders for themselves. You can learn techniques and become a leader for yourself. The first requirement, if you are going to produce a leader for a cause, is that he should be dedicated, so you have to find ways of making him dedicated.

Now I told you this human material which the Communist Party uses is not special human material—it is not a particular sort of person who goes to communism. That is true of types, true of classes too. The Communist Party draws its members from every class. It is quite wrong to suppose that it simply appeals to the have-nots, that it simply appeals to the working class. Communism has, in fact, probably been more successful with the educated and middle class than with the very poor, bearing in mind the difference in the sizes of the classes.

It is true to say that communism draws its people from every class—so it is that no particular race has a special

tendency to become communist. When I think of the dedicated people I have known who were hard core communist members, I think of just as many people drawn from races in the mission countries as in the mission-sending countries.

I came quite literally from the communist world to the Catholic world with no gap in between. As soon as I began to meet Catholics and mix with them as friends (I had never known a Catholic as a friend in my life until I went to a Jesuit and asked to be instructed—I had already taken all my hurdles by then) as soon as I began to move in Catholic circles, I came across a certain sort of corny joke concerning the alleged fact that if you are a Catholic, you are always having collections taken, you are always being asked to give to this and that. I tell you quite honestly I watched the plate going around the church on Sunday with a sense of embarrassment—when I saw the size of the contributions that were made by the people in my suburb and compared these with the sort of communist collections which I was used to.

Faith in People

The communists make much bigger demands on their people than we make on ours and they do it for good reasons. They believe, as I told you earlier, that if you make big demands upon people, you will get a big response and so this is a deliberate policy on their part. They will never make the small demand if they can make the big one. It is not done with a gun at your head. You have to find ways and means of doing it. But it is good psychology to ask for a lot.

This is one of many, many, many paradoxes which we shall see in the course of this seminar, in this whole question of communism. They show a faith in their people which we often are not prepared to show. They ask an enormous amount and they expect to get a big response.

At the same time they are hard-headed enough to know that it is not enough to have an organisation of enthusiasts. It is not enough to have sacrifice, dedication and zeal. These are important; they are, as I said, the starting point.

They are what helps to ensure that when you make a man a leader he will continue to lead for the cause and not for himself. But you have got to have training; you have got to have preparation; you have got to have instruction as well if you are going to achieve this.

And so the communists set about trying to use this enthusiasm, this dedication, this human material which is at their disposal just as effectively as they can. They have worked out their ways of using that material effectively. They have a slogan inside the Communist Party; *every communist a leader; every factory a fortress*.

I will explain what they mean by that: every communist a leader will be clear to you. They set out to make every hard core member into a trained leader. Later I shall be telling you the sort of mechanics of the thing, how they do it. That is their aim and so when you have thousands of dedicated people—people trained to lead, naturally they make an impact. The communist is expected to lead—to offer a lead to others wherever he goes, no matter in what situation he may find himself.

When they say “every factory a fortress” they mean that wherever you have any sort of communist organisation at all (which means three or more communists, because three or more communists form a unit of the Communist Party); in any place of work, they should set out to make that place a fortress for communism).

Call for big Sacrifices

In other words, they should so spread their influence and establish themselves as leaders of the working people there that they cannot be touched by anyone.

This is the communist approach to leaders. First, you should believe in the human material you have at your disposal. You should not be afraid to make big demands upon it and you should try intelligently and skillfully to call for sacrifices, making them big and following through with other sacrifices.

Then you should also use your people well. The communists believe that it is necessary for their recruits to understand their communism; to learn it. They believe

that they should learn it in order to use it; to use what they learn. Marx finished one of his books with some really very wonderful words: "*The philosophers have only tried to explain the world; the job, however, is to change it.*"

A World to Win

Communists all over the world have this slogan. They believe that they can change the world. They believe that they can change it in our lifetime. This is not just a dream on their part. They believe that they have a whole technique, a whole science, as it were, to make this possible.

Marx finished his *Communist Manifesto* with the words: "*You have a world to win.*" These words are in the mind of every communist all the time. He is out to change the world but has a world to win. He has a clear goal, knows what he is trying to work toward, something to which he aspires, something which he feels to be a goal, capable of realisation.

But you see the sheer tragedy of it—see the tragedy of the sort of people I have been talking to you about, giving all this dedication, giving all this zeal, giving all this energy, giving all this sacrifice to the worst thing that men ever had, while we who have got so much, so often give so little to it. Or we are afraid to ask others to give anything to it.

The communists have the worst creed on earth and they shout it from the housetops. Too often those of us who have got the best creed speak with a muted voice if we speak at all. If anyone is going to change the world, it ought to be us. If we started applying our Christianity to the society in which we live, then it would be we who would change the world. It is tragic to realise that the communists are thinking in terms of a world to win; this ought to be our slogan. There is no reason at all why we should not adopt it. There is no reason why the communists should have some sort of monopoly on it.

I think we will have to come to something of the approach that communists themselves have.

Book Review

WHEN WILL THEY EVER LEARN ?

British Guiana by Peter Newman; Oxford University Press for Institute of Race Relationship; pp. 104; 9s. 6d.

THE refrain of this haunting folk-song goes through my mind every time I pick up the paper and read of some fresh tragedy striking the developing countries. Its query is directed to wishful western liberals. It is done, I think, with good reason. Their determination to sacrifice fact to theory has played havoc with the lives of poor people the world over. One can forgive the initial naivete, despite the disasters it has brought in its train. What one cannot forgive is the continued, wilful blindness that compels the liberals to push their theories in the face of disasters largely of their own making. Still less can one forgive the fake objectivity—the suiting of facts to theory—through which they seek to justify this process.

An example is afforded by a recent study of British Guiana published at the end of last year for the Institute of Race Relations by the Oxford University Press. I have little quarrel with those of its chapters which deal with the Colony's historical and geographical background, its economic life and demographic potential. In these, objectivity is carried to the point of dessication. One is presented with columns of figures which are useful as points of reference, but leave the reader with little knowledge of the realities of the country's life. It is rather like trying to describe a beautiful girl in terms only of her vital statistics. The thing cannot be done. Nevertheless, in these sections of his essay, Professor Newman has obviously gone to considerable trouble to get at the facts. For this we can be grateful.

When, however, he turns to the political situation in the Colony objectivity appears to desert him. A friend of mine, long resident in British Guiana, described Professor Newman's treatment of Guianese politics as "full of errors".

My own reading of the relevant sections of his essay confirms this opinion. There is an example here of what I have already noted. Objectivity deserts men when the price paid is the renunciation of pet theories. This is the liberal vice. If the facts do not fit the theory, they must be made to do so and the theory given concrete expression, even though the result in terms of human suffering may well be quite unparalleled.

For the liberal, mass democracy is a sacred cow. It **must, therefore, be imposed on people** irrespective of consequences, the chief of which to-day will be the use of its machinery by international Communism to work for the eventual enslavement of the unfortunate inhabitants of newly independent countries. We have seen this process at work in the Congo. We have seen it in South Vietnam after the decision of American liberals that Diem should die in the interests of mobocracy. We shall see it in Aden, now that the decision has been taken to turn Colony and Protectorate into a unitary State. The bazaar mob will soon take charge there in the name of majority rule. Meanwhile, liberal eyes are closed to sinister forces waiting to take advantage of the confusion created by this situation, intent only on using the kind of democracy for which their hirelings shout now as a camouflage for future enslavement. Inconvenient facts are forgotten now by the liberal in order that a theory may find expression. People, once again, will fall victims to an outworn formula. He is interested only in its establishment. Once this has been done, he regards his mission as accomplished. People mean nothing to him.

Professor Newman would seem to be of this mentality. How explain otherwise his apparent refusal to recognise the one central fact which is basic to an understanding of Guianese politics. Reference, of course, is to Jagan's Communism. The Professor refuses to take it seriously. So much so, that he dismisses Britain's landing of troops at Georgetown in October, 1953, as partly explicable "in terms of the anti-Communist hysteria of those McCarthy ridden years". Later, he speaks with disdain of the

"hysterical anti-Communist line" adapted by Peter D'Aguiar and his followers. Yet, they had every reason to take an anti-Communist line for one very good reason; Jagan was and is a Communist. There is a great deal of evidence to this effect. So far as I know, it has never been refuted. I assembled most of it in an article published in the *Catholic Herald* for October 25th, 1963. The key quotation is provided by a statement made to Mr. Lionel Luckhoo, Q.C., by Sir Henry Wynn Parry, Chairman of the Commission sent to inquire into the disturbances in British Guiana, which culminated in the tragic Georgetown riots of Black Friday, February 12th, 1962. Jagan was under intensive cross-examination by Mr. Luckhoo in the presence of the Chairman of the Commission. Towards the close of that section of the cross-examination, which dealt with Jagan's communist leanings, Sir Henry Wynn Parry made the following observation: "I think you may take it Mr. Luckhoo" he said, "that you have established that he (Dr. Jagan) is an avowed Communist and has not changed his views subsequent to Black Friday".

Most who know British Guiana and have approached its problems with an open mind would conclude that a statement of this weight made in such circumstances, when combined with other available evidence as presented, for instance, in my *Herald* article, affords complete proof of Jagan's Communism. (That of his wife was never in doubt). They would agree with the account given by the British Government in a White Paper of the events which led to the landing of troops at Georgetown in October, 1953. They would agree with the verdict passed even then on the Jagans when it said they were "zealots in the cause of Communism and have demonstrated by their actions that their objective is to impose a totalitarian control on their Party, the trade unions, the police force, the youth organisations and the State itself".

This, then, is the central factor in the Guianese political scene. It has been for ten years; not race, but Communism stirring up and using racialism to cloak and further its ultimate design. As a result of heroic efforts made by

Father Andrew Gordon, S.J., and Peter D'Aguiar a small, but significantly responsible section of the Guianese people began to see this in 1960. Professor Newman, apparently, has not done so yet. As a result, the political pages of his essay are not merely worthless, but misleading. What other verdict can one pass on an attempt to interpret the Guianese or, for that matter, any other political situation without significant reference to the central factor which governs its life? It is like studying World War II without more than a passing reference to Winston Churchill. Such an endeavour would be condemned in advance to futility. This, I am afraid, is what one has here. There is little need to cite specific instances. Readers who wish can compare my account of British Guiana's troubles published in *Christian Order* for February, 1963, with the last twenty-eight pages of Professor Newman's essay. Those who know the Colony, in particular, will take rightful exception to the temper of his political writing. With justice, they will pass adverse comment on the tone of his reference to the British landing at Georgetown in October, 1953; his biased presentation of the disturbances which followed the Kaldor budget in early 1962, the general strike of 1963 and the strike action in the canefields a year later. There is much else that one could cite. I see no point in doing so. Let the reader judge for himself.

In conclusion, let me say, once again, that I find intensely disturbing the disparity which exists between Professor Newman's political writing and that which covers the rest of his essay. On the one hand, an objective, if dry, appraisal of events; on the other, subjectivism to an entirely unwarranted degree. One can only conclude, with regret, that the Author has succumbed to liberal prejudice of the worst kind or else drawn his political material from biased secondary sources. Both lines of action merit the same condemnation. In a scholar, either is inexcusable.

Paul Crane, S.J.

SCOOP

Father Paul Crane writes:

Douglas Hyde's name has long been a by-word throughout the developing countries of the world. It is quite typical that, when I phoned him the other day, I found myself talking to a man who had just that moment got back from Malaysia. It is typical also that, on this occasion, he should have granted, at once and so generously, the request I put to him.

It came about in this fashion. I had read with growing excitement a series of eight lectures which he gave, in the summer of 1962, to a gathering of missionaries specially convened for the occasion in the United States. In them, Hyde examined the ingredients of the communist dynamic and compared it with our own; what, in other words, makes Communists tick and Christians falter.

The comparison goes against us. Hence the question, can we take what is good from the communist dynamic and apply it to ourselves? I found Hyde's answer fascinating and of immense value; so much so that I determined to seek his permission to print his lectures as a series in *Christian Order*. I was on the phone to him for this reason. He granted my request at once. The series begins this month. Its publication represents something of a scoop.

I do not see how anyone can afford to neglect Hyde's penetrating analysis. We all have to learn the lesson it contains, particularly those at work in the developing countries. Readers of *Christian Order* are asked to cash in on the opportunity presented by this wonderful series and to do all they can to make the magazine more widely known. The price of 12 issues of *Christian Order* is 15s. in England and \$3.00 in the United States. Send subscriptions, please, to the Editor at 65 Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1.

THE ENGLISH and WELSH MARTYRS



A NEW OFFICIAL PICTURE OF
THE FORTY MARTYRS
IN BEAUTIFUL COLOUR READY FOR FRAMING

Available in two sizes:

36" x 44"
Price 33/6

27" x 25"
Price 24/-

(Postage Paid)

Office of the Vice-Postulation, 31, Farm St., London,
W.1

Please send me copies of the
FORTY MARTYRS PICTURE—Size

I enclose remittance for £.....

NAME

ADDRESS